

8

Docket No. PPD-100TC1
Serial No. 09/894,432Remarks

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. By this response, applicant requests that claim 8 be canceled since it duplicates subject matter recited in the base claim. Further, applicant requests that claims 9 and 10 be amended so that they do not depend from a canceled claim. Finally, applicant request that claim 21 be added.

Several replacement paragraphs are offered to correct obvious typographical errors and omissions. Further, applicant amends the paragraph entitled CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS to include a recitation that the parent application claims the benefits of a provisional patent application. Applicant respectfully requests that these replacement paragraphs be accepted and entered.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-16 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Salley in view of Wilson. Salley describes an article carrier for storing items which is designed to be installed on the door of an automobile. An internal frame prevents the carrier from sagging under the weight of stored items. Wilson describes a fishing tackle bag that has transparent pocket to hold fishing lures. The pockets are formed by folding and stitching a sheet of material to the back wall of the bag to form pockets having a pleated appearance. The Office Action states it would have been obvious to form the pockets of Salley in the manner taught by Wilson to obtain the benefits inherent in the design of Wilson.

The storage device of the subject invention provides inhabitants of a recreational vehicle (RV) safe, convenient shoe storage. The subject storage device has a width that is substantially greater than its height so that it fits along the unused space on the pedestal of a queen-sized bed in an RV. The compartments of the storage device of the subject invention are formed so that the compartments have an interior volume defined by a horizontal cross-section that increase in area with the height of the compartment. The compartments are configured as such so that large, bulky items, such as, size 14 shoes, can be stored in the pockets.

Salley found it necessary to add a reinforcing frame to his automobile article carrier so that it would not sag under the weight of the items stored in the device. Salley therefore would not have been motivated to form even larger pockets on his device so they could hold larger and heavier

items. Further, the pocket of Wilson are configured to hold odd sized lures, he does not suggest the pockets can be enlarged to hold larger, heavier items. The prior art must provide some teaching, suggestion or incentive to make the combination made by the inventor Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant submits there is no such suggestion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Salley in view of Wilson and further in view of Harnish. Harnish describes a cushion for an automobile seat back that has an internal storage pouch. The cushion can be attached to the seat back with hook and loop fasteners. The Office Action states it would have been obvious to use the attachment means of hook and loop tape taught by Harnish to fasten the storage device of the subject invention to the bed pedestal. As mentioned above, the references of Salley and Wilson, alone or in combination, do not suggest or describe the storage device of the subject invention. The description by Harnish of using hook and loop fasteners to attach a cushion to a seat back does not cure this defect. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Salley in view of Wilson and further in view of Cirigliano. Claim 9 recites that the compartments of the storage device of the subject invention can differ in height from one another. Cirigliano describes a tote bag for tools that has a plurality of pockets adapted to contain a workman's tools. The pockets are layered upon the back panel with taller item standing in rear pockets and shorter item stored in front pockets. The Office Action states it would have been obvious to vary the height of the pocket on the subject storage device as taught by Cirigliano to allow storage and easy retrieval of different sized objects. The pockets on the tote bag of Cirigliano are not configured to hold bulky items like the pleated compartments on the storage device of the subject invention. Further, the pleated compartments of the subject invention could not be layered one upon the other like the pockets of Cirigliano. A pleated compartment would not support another pleated compartment attached to its front. Cirigliano does not suggest providing pockets of different sizes on a back panel. Salley and Wilson do not suggest or describe the storage device of the subject invention. When viewed in combination

10

Docket No. PPD-100TC1
Serial No. 09/894,432

these references likewise do not suggest the subject device. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

The subject invention is a unique storage device that safely and securely stores shoes in a recreational vehicle. The cited references do not suggest or describe such a device.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the amendments to the claims, applicant believes that the claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any of this response, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean Kyle
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 36,987
Phone No.: (406) 375-1317
Address : P.O. Box 2274
Hamilton, MT 59840-4274